

POETRY.

For the Liberator.

MARTYRS.

In the old time were heroes—
Men with courage bold and high;
Men, who, with a faith unshaken,
Fared not for the Truth to die.
In the strength of noble manhood,
For the Right their lives they gave,
Quailing not when rack or fagot
Oped for them a martyr's grave!

Conscience was to them a teacher,
And its earnest voice of power
Gave them strength to stand undaunted,
In the darkest trial-hour.
Laws, if cruel and oppressive,
Were to them no rule or guide;
Tyrants ne'er received their homage,
Though by thousands defied.

True to God, and true to duty,
Flatterers' praise they never sought;
Nor was honor, wealth, or station,
By a life of falsehood bought.
Warm humanity was beating
In each noble, generous heart;
They, like Mary, heard Christ's teachings—
Chose with her 'the better part.'

And their spirit has not left us:
Men like them are living now,
With a faith like theirs unshaken,
And the truths they teach deride.
And the oppressor in his greatness,
Like the Levite, 'step aside'—
Though the friends they loved and trusted,
Meet them with averted eye,
And, in place of kindly greetings,
Pass in stately silence by;
Though the poisoned shafts of Malice
Deeply wound the trusting heart,
And the venomous breath of Slander
Doth assail with deadly art—
Yet the true man falters never!
Still the cross he bears on high,
Knowing though it lead to Calvary,
Truth with him shall never die.
For the Master whom he serveth,
That dark way has trod before—
He will strengthen and support him,
Till life's conflicts all are o'er.

From the San Francisco Pacific.
FILLIBUSTERING:
THE ETHICS OF IT.

Says Captain Cobb to Father Cobb,
Your farm is very fine, sir;
Please give me up your title deeds,
I claim it all as mine, sir.

'Pray how can it be mine?' says Cobb,
My sure I never sold it;
'Twas left me by my father, sir—
I only ought to hold it.

'Pay, Cobb, the "march of destiny!"
This strange you don't perceive it;
Is sure to make it mine, some day;
I solemnly believe it.

'But have you not already got
More land than you can till, sir?
More rocks than you can ever blast?
More weeds than you can kill, sir?

'Ay, Cobb; but something whispers me—
A sort of inspiration—
That I've a right to every farm
Not under cultivation.

I'm of the "Anglo-Saxon race,"
A people known to fame, sir;
But you—what right have you to land?
Who ever heard your name, sir?

'I deem you, Cobb, a lazy lout,
Poor, trodden-down, and blind, sir;
And if I take your useless land,
You ought to think it kind, sir;

And with my scientific skill,
I set it down as true, sir,
That I can gather from the farm
Full twice as much as you, sir.

'To be explicit: 'Tis an age
Of freedom and progression;
No longer, dog-in-manger like,
Can you retain possession.

The farm long since you forfeited,
Because you failed to till it;
To me it clearly now belongs,
Simply because—I will it.

My logic if you disapprove,
Or fail of comprehending,
Or do not feel convinced that I
Your welfare am intending,

I've plenty more of arguments
To which I can resort, sir—
Six shovels, rills, bow-knives,
Will indicate the sort, sir.

'So, prithee, Cobb, take my advice:
Make over your domain, sir;
Or, sure as I am Captain Cobb,
Will I—blow out your brains, sir!

Poor Cobb can only grind his teeth,
And grumble protestations,
That might should be the rule of right
Among enlightened nations.

From the Rhode Island Freeman.
SOLLOQUY OF NEBRASKA.

Thinks he, base traitor! spawn of sin!
This monstrous "Bill" will go,
And Slavery flood this vast domain?
I tell thee, Douglas, no!

Thinks the arch fiend his power can make
That deadly Upas grow
Beneath my Rocky Mountain shades?
I tell thee, Douglas, no!

Long as free winds from Northern skies
Across my prairies blow,
No slave shall break this virgin soil!
I tell thee, Douglas, no!

From Britain's Lion on the North,
To sunny Mexico,
No human bloodhounds shall be seen—
I tell thee, Douglas, no!

Missouri, Platte, and Yellow Stone,
May sooner backward flow,
Than freedom live with slavery here—
I tell thee, Douglas, no!

Here Kickapoo and wild Pawnee
May bow to Manito;
But never man to human power!
I tell thee, Douglas, no!

The sons of Pilgrims never will
Such heritage bestow,
To blast their race in coming time—
I tell thee, Douglas, no!

Vile cat! if he has lost his all
In this one desperate throw—
He'll never be a President—
I tell thee, Douglas, no!

EPIGRAM.

Who helps a knave in knavery,
But aids an ape to climb a tree.

THE LIBERATOR.

GREAT DEBATE ON THE BIBLE.
BETWEEN MR. JOSEPH BARKER, OF OHIO, AND
REV. DR. BERG, OF PHILADELPHIA.

(Continued.)

FIFTH EVENING—Continued.

Mr. BARKER. (Slight applause, hisses.) A curious place, truly, to put a window—in the roof! a three-storyed ark, ventilated by a roof-sky-light! Through this, the eight persons were to throw all the fifth made by half a million of animals; through this, the lay road for water, not only for drinking, but for making all clean. A curious explanation, truly! Besides, if you should ask any farmer accustomed to keeping cattle, whether, in a barn one hundred and fifty yards long, twenty-five wide, and fifteen deep, or in one of the dimensions claimed by my opponent, he could winter seven pairs of every species of fowl and clean beast, and two pairs of every unclean beast, adding other beasts in sufficient number for the sustenance of the carnivorous animals, and have room to stow away enough grain, grass and other kinds of food for the rest, he would laugh at you. And the wintering would be for four or five months only, and not for twelve or eighteen. He would laugh more, should you ask him whether Noah, with his wife and his three sons and their wives, could tend all these animals, clean the ark, and keep the air pure, and that a roof-sky-light—the worst place possible for the purposes of ventilation! For the number of species of animals, my opponent quotes Buffon, an out-of-date author, who wrote before zoology had taken its present scientific form; also of Cuvier as an authority of mine. I never referred to Cuvier. I quoted from Prof. Hitchcock, a distinguished geologist of your own country, and President of one of its leading colleges. I will again read the passages—

'The first difficulty in the way of supposing the flood to have been literally universal, is the great quantity of water that would have been requisite. The amount necessary to cover the earth to the tops of the highest mountains, or about five miles above the present oceans, would be eight times greater than that existing on the globe at this time.

A second objection to such a universality is, the difficulty of providing for the animals in the ark. Calculations have, indeed, been made, which seemed to show that the ark was capacious enough to hold the pairs and septuagies of all the species. But, unfortunately, the number of species assumed to exist by the calculators was vastly below the truth. It amounted only to three or four hundred; whereas, the actual number already described by zoologists is no less than one hundred and fifty thousand; and the probable number existing on the globe is not less than half a million. And, for the greater part of these, most provision have been made, since most of them inhabit either the air or the dry land. A thousand species of mammalia, six thousand species of birds, two thousand species of reptiles, and one hundred and twenty thousand species of insects, are already described, and must have been provided with space and food. Will any one believe this possible, in a vessel not more than four hundred and fifty feet long, seventy-five feet broad, and forty-five feet high?

'The first and most important objection to the universality of the Deluge is derived from the facts brought to light by modern science, respecting the distribution of animals and plants on the globe. If tropical animals and plants, for instance, were to migrate to the temperate zone, and especially to the frigid regions, they could not long survive; and almost equally fatal would it be for the animals and plants of high latitudes to take up their abode near the equator. Now, suppose the animals of the torrid zone at the present day to attempt, by natural means, to reach the temperate zone, who does not know that nearly all of them must perish?'—[President Hitchcock's 'Religion of Geology,' pp. 128-131.]

Why, the food requisite for the gaminivorous animals alone, for eighteen months, would have filled the ark. And of this, much would have had to be preserved green for the insects. The sheep necessary for a single pair of lions would have occupied no inconsiderable space; and the sheep, in their turn, would have needed large quantities of fodder. Besides, all these animals could not be packed like bales of cotton. Those who tended them needed room to go about the stalls, for the purpose of cleaning, feeding, and watering them; as well as room to pass up and down stairs. If, too, they had to go up stairs for water, if they had to carry up stairs all the refuse, we cannot help thinking what a getting up stairs there must have been! (Laughter.)

My opponent's talk about the ark carrying 48,413 tons is simply ridiculous. However well built, it could not, with its dimensions, have carried, in a universal deluge, much more than a tenth of the burden. Suppose the window in the roof, where they would have got fresh air while the rain was pouring down through the open windows of heaven? How would eight people manage so large a vessel, besides tending so large a number of animals? Again: the small animals would want separate accommodation, and room for way, and room above would be needed. Many of the large animals would require from one to ten thousand feet each. Even a house of the dimensions given, would not hold a tenth of the dimensions of mammals and birds alone, with food for thirteen or eighteen months, to say nothing of the creeping things. Six hundred species of birds have already been described. Of each of these, seven pairs were to be preserved. This would make eighty-four thousand birds. We have next, a thousand species of mammalia described. There would have to be room in the ark for about three thousand. The number existing, however, would probably be three times as great. It is monstrous to talk of such a multitude being accommodated in a floating vessel of such dimensions. One fiftieth part could not be accommodated and supplied with food in such a vessel. The impossibilities implied in the story are almost innumerable.

The Doctor asked me the name of the God I worship. I told him, God. To this he objects that this term is generic; that an individual, when asked his name, does not answer by calling himself 'mankind,' but must give the name which distinguishes him from other men. Now, I was not aware that there were so many Gods; I thought there was but one. Men need different names, because they are many; but there is only one God, and He needs but one name. The Doctor says that his God made the heavens, and asks me what mine has done. I am happy that for once we are agreed; for that is my God, too.

He speaks of the beautiful passage in Job, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth,' &c. The best commentators agree that the sense given by him to the passage has no authority in the original text; but in the translation only.

He says that Pain was a loathsome drunkard and a filthy debauchee, and alleges that I said the account he read of Pain's last moments was untrue. What I said was, the account stood ready to belie every reformer—that I knew they had belied his writings, and supposed that I had done the same by his private character. I know, by experience, how eager, unscrupulous and reckless, Christians are in slandering unbelievers. A Christian lady, who has attended this debate, said I had come upon the platform half drunk. Now, I have not taken a glass of intoxicating drink for nineteen years. A minister in one of your pulpits charged me with something much worse than this. If they will heap upon me a thousand slanders, if they will say these things of living men, who can answer for themselves, what will they not say of dead men, who have no power to defend themselves? All manner of evil is said about every one identified with an unpopular movement. If the chief priests called Jesus an impostor and the prince of devils, surely no other reformer can expect to be exempted from such abuse.

The Doctor informs us that few only are lost—that the vast majority of the human family are saved. My answer shall be in the words of Christ—'Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereto. Because straight is the gate and narrow the way which leadeth unto life,

and few there be which find it.' Now, if 'many' be more than 'few,' the Bible is on my side.

He says that children are taken into heaven; but the passage he referred to for proof says no such thing, but that only heaven is composed of people like little children.

He speaks of 'my love of vice.' This requires no answer. I suppose my character will bear comparison with the character of the best in the Church or priesthood.

He ridiculed the inner light, and says, if a thief picked your pocket, his conscience troubles him a moment, and all is right. This is not our doctrine. Man's nature will not be satisfied, the wound will not be healed,—till the evil-doer has tried to undo the wrong. But are they the men who follow the inner light that pick your pockets? Are they not the men who study the laws of their being, and labor to follow them? Were the early Quakers addicted to pocket-picking? Was William Penn celebrated for pocket-picking? Was George Fox? The Orthodox picked the Quakers' pockets, and robbed them of their liberty, and life besides; but when did these followers of the inner light retaliate? (Applause, hisses, one hiss from the platform.)

But if a man has no conscience? asks my opponent. We answer, if a man has no conscience, what can the Bible do for him? But there are no such men. There are men whose consciences have been perverted by false theologies and moralities; but none are born without. Our law teaches to develop conscience, and all the moral and intellectual powers and impulses. It is a fact, that unbelievers are generally more conscientious than believers. What men have most credit in the market or on 'change? The very pious, or the men who make no pretensions to piety?

My opponent still talks of his eternal hell, as if a father could not be satisfied with the improvement or amendment of his children, but must torture them forever, without regard to their amendment. This Orthodox theology is a blinding and a brutifying power. Again: those who follow the inner light, or unbelievers, are not only the most upright and honest of men, but the most philanthropic and reformatory. Who are every where the men of progress? Those called Infidels. Who are every where the conservatives? The priests. Wherever so-called Infidels have been most numerous, progress has been most rapid and general; wherever priests have been in power, it has been slowest.

Which was the friend of truth, of science, and of man, Galileo, who proclaimed the true system of the universe, in defiance of the Bible; or the Pope and his Bible-believing cardinals, who thrust him into prison, and kept him there, in darkness and misery, till his health and spirits failed? And who are now the reformers, the men of progress? The men who toil for science,—who study Nature,—who respect her oracles,—are chiefly unbelievers; while the men who frown on science,—who denounce the revelations of Nature as infidelity,—who frown on geologists, naturalists and physiologists, are the worshippers of the Bible. The men of moral progress, the foes of despotism and tyranny, the friends of freedom and justice, the republicans, the democrats, the advocates of universal human rights, are the unbelievers. It is so in Europe; it is so in America. Your pulpits men are nearly all Tories. In England, they are for drink and despotism. In America, they are for oligarchy and slavery.

My opponent asks, who established the law which causes the drunkard's disease to descend to his offspring? Suppose we should say God? would God be answerable for the disease inflicted by the drunkard? Who established the law which enables one man to slander, rob, or kill another? Suppose we say God? will my opponent say God is answerable for all slanders, robberies and murders? God simply gives man a power; it is man that is answerable for the use of that power. It is well men should have influence over another: it is not well they should use it for mischief. Man's power to injure the unborn babe no more reflects on God, than the power to injure the upgrown man. It is the abuse of the power that is to be regretted. But what would my opponent prove? Would he justify the revenge, the injustice, the cruelty attributed to God in the Bible, by proving the existence of something wrong in Nature? Would two wrongs make a right? Prove the God of Nature as unjust, as mean, as cruel as the God of the Bible, and you prove we ought to hate and curse both. But the God of Nature, and the God of the Bible, are not alike.

We come now to the Doctor's speech on internal evidence.

The Doctor made a number of statements in favor of the Bible, but how many of them did he prove? He did not even attempt to prove one of them. With the exception of one or two, which amount to nothing, they cannot be proved. They are not true.

He says the Bible has a peculiar gravity, dignity, and solemnity of style.

Read Solomon's songs, or the childish fables of Genesis, or the ridiculous revelations which abound in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and about the tabernacle, altar, priestly attire, and see whether it has.

But is every thing written in a grand and solemn style of superhuman origin? Then the world has superhuman books in abundance.

He says there is not a subject in the whole circle of the sciences to which allusion is not made in the Bible. Suppose it were true, what then? Would it prove the Book divine? No more than it proves the American Encyclopedia divine. But it is not true. I could mention a thousand subjects, of great importance, to which the Bible makes no allusion, and a thousand more after that.

He says every subject is presented in the Bible with a power, a truthfulness and a clearness unparalleled. It was a pity he made no attempt to prove his statement. Every subject presented with clearness? I thought certain portions of the Bible were remarkable for their mysteriousness. Truthfulness? Why, some of its statements are the most monstrous falsehoods the mind of man can conceive.

He says not a solitary ray discrepancy of precept, doctrine or fact can be proved against it. And this was said before an audience that had listened to the historical, theological and moral contradictions which we had just before mentioned.

The Doctor says the teachings of the Bible are in harmony with all the discoveries of science. Did he try to prove this? But I had forgot; the Doctor did not finish his speech. Perhaps he will try to prove his statements toward the close. We shall see.

He says the Book of Job or the Psalms would have been sufficient to give immortality to their authors, on the ground of their literary merit alone. This we are willing to acknowledge; but is every work of superior literary merit of superhuman origin? If so, we have superhuman books without end. Every nation has them. Every age produces them.

We not only acknowledge the great literary merit of portions of the Bible, but the excellency of the morality of several portions of the book. But what then? We find both high literary merit and beautiful moral principles in thousands of books, which make no pretensions to superhuman origin. Again: it is worthy of remark, that some of those portions of the Bible, which excel as literary compositions, embody or inculcate moral principles of the most revolting character.

Take the 137th Psalm; a more beautiful little poem can hardly be imagined. But look at its close: 'O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed—happy shall be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones.' It is thus with several of the Psalms. Poetical beauty accompanies the most savage and revengeful sentiments. We have, in our day, poetry equal in beauty to the best of the Psalms, and far surpassing them in truthfulness and morality.

The Doctor says I have wonderful powers of sophistry. I have often observed that when my opponents find my arguments unanswerable, they raise the cry of sophistry. If I were really to use sophistry, they would expose it; but when they find nothing but unanswerable arguments, they give them an ugly name, and try

to get out of the way. Such devices may impose on some, but not on all. They may answer for a time; but not for ever.

The Doctor says the word Godhead, in Romans, means the unity of God. He acknowledges, at last, you see, that Nature does reveal the unity of God.

He says that Romans xiii. is intended to show what kind of rulers are worthy of reverence and obedience. We answer, the passage itself proves the contrary. Let us read—

'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.'

Can words be plainer? If these words do not teach that all powers, all rulers, are ordained of God—that the governments then existing were of God—that every Christian was to be subject to them, and obey them—and that whosoever dared to resist them should receive damnation, there are no words that can express such a meaning. If the writer had meant to say, whenever you have got good rulers, who command only what is good, and forbid only what is evil, obey them, he could easily have said so. He could as easily have said what he thought, as what he did not think. To suppose that God, or even a man of common sense, would say: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God; whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance; and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation;'—when he simply meant, Obey good governments,—such governments as give only good and righteous commands,—is out of all reason.

Besides, if the passage meant no more than what my opponent says, it would amount to nothing. Obey good governments. But can every government be said to be good? Who is to judge? The governments themselves? Then we must obey all; for where is the government that will acknowledge it is not good? Must every one judge? The command is as good as none; it leaves men perfectly at liberty.

Again, in corresponding passages, about masters and servants, servants are commanded, expressly, to obey, not only the good, gentle masters, but the forward, And wives are commanded to obey, not only Christian husbands, but unconverted Pagan husbands.

The Doctor said our law was a law of wax. But what is his, if its precepts can be dealt with as he deals with the passage before us?

Besides, were the good governments he talks about—the governments that commanded nothing but what was good, and forbade nothing but what was evil? There were no Christian governments. Were the Pagan governments so good as to command nothing but what was good, forbid nothing but what was evil? What, then, becomes of my opponent's remarks about the darkness and depravity of the Pagan world?

The interpretation of my opponent is the most forced and unnatural conceivable. It is not an interpretation, but a perversion. Of course, it is very inconvenient to have such passages in a favorite book; but there they are.

Take, then, the passage in its plain and unperverted meaning, and it enjoins the basest servility to despotic power, and teaches the grossest and most palpable falsehoods to be found in any book on earth. It dooms to damnation the best, the bravest, and the noblest spirits that ever honored and bled humanity. Cromwell and Hampden, Milton and Sidney, Kosciuszko and Marzani, and men to whom your own great country has given birth, whose names are worthy of everlasting remembrance, and whose virtuous deeds and noble daring have made them the idols of the friends of freedom, and the lights and guides of the world, it consigns to the horrors of damnation. It is a happy thing that men are so often better than their creeds and sacred books. If it were not that men are impelled to great and noble deeds, in spite of their old authorities and guides, no man could take up arms against a tyrant, till he had renounced his faith in the Bible. As it is, men who war with tyrants and with tyranny, as well as reformers generally, must be looked for among the hosts of unbelievers.

The Doctor says there is nothing in the Bible about God, that is contrary to reason.

We answer, none passages say Jacob, and the elders of Israel, and Issachar, said God; while others say, no man hath seen or can see him. One class of passages must be contrary to reason.

Besides, we have proved, by a hundred passages, that the Bible attributes to God, not only human infirmities, but the greatest cruelty and injustice.

He says language is incompetent to express the real character of God. Then why should any one use it for that purpose? But I thought the Doctor told us that some portions of the Bible did express God's character truly.

Our opponent says we pervert the language of Scripture. A strange charge this, to come from one who could deal, as he did, with the passage in Romans, and others! It is especially strange to be made against one who takes the Bible exactly as he finds it, and who grounds all his statements on its plain and obvious meaning.

He says we reject the truth because it is so simple, and that we are influenced by the worst of motives. Does not our opponent know how easy it would be for us to return such charges? But we hope to be preserved from yielding to the strong temptation. We have no infallible book to guide us, but we think we can see a better way than charging an opponent, in public debate, with impure and vicious motives. There is a precept in the Gospel, which says, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.' We do not ourselves regard the precept as divine or unobjectionable; but a person who does so regard it, would do well not to violate it so often in a public audience. However, we believe that a man is justified by works, and not by faith alone, and we should try to act accordingly.

He says the Bible is a wonder. So it is, in more respects than one.

He says it has been proved, over and over again, that all the parts of the Bible agree. Will he please to find us one of those proofs? We never had the happiness to see one.

His remarks about raking up things out of gutters, scavenger work, and the like, my opponent will allow me to pass unnoticed.

He speaks of the arguments of unbelievers being overwhelmed. I recollect no such instance of such a thing in the present debate. And Pain's arguments have never been beat. Let me say here, that those who have not read Pain's works, cannot conceive how wretched are the pretended refutations which have appeared under the sanction of the clergy.

He says that the best evidence of the Divine origin of the Scriptures is the substantial agreement and circumstantial variation in their statements. But he gave us no proof. He favored us with an application of his principle to passages, by way of illustration. The truth is, his boasted principle does not fit the passages which I have quoted. He cannot find any substantial agreement in them. Examine a few. One passage says no one hath seen God at any time; other passages say several people have seen him. Where is the substantial agreement here?

Some passages say there is no respect of persons with God; while others say he loved one brother, and hated the other, before either was born. Where is the substantial agreement here? Take a few historical passages.

The Bible states, in one passage, that God tempted David to number the people; and in another, that he was Satan that tempted him. Where is the substantial agreement here? Are God and Satan the same?

The Bible states, in one place, that the two thieves reviled Jesus; and in another, that one only reviled

him, and was rebuked by the other. Where is the substantial agreement? Is one two? (Interjection by a cry of Time.) The Moderators will attend to their duty, if permitted.

The Bible states, in one place, that a certain man was two years older than his father, and, in another, that he was eighteen years younger. Where is the substantial agreement here?

The Bible states that Saul slew all the Amalekites, except Agag, and that Samuel hewed Agag in pieces; but it also states, that, after this, David went out to war against the Amalekites. Where is the substantial agreement here?

The Bible says, in one passage, that Judas bought a field, and broke asunder in the midst, and his bowels gushed out; and another says that the high priests bought the field, and that Judas hanged himself. Where is the substantial agreement here?

Here are substantial, radical differences; irreconcilable variations.

Besides, the maxim which he cites applicable only to human courts, where human witnesses, liable to err, testify, and where it is necessary to sift the truth from the mass of their statements. It is not applicable to a book which pretends, or which its advocates pretend, consists of the declarations of the omniscient God, who cannot err or speak falsely. In a book written by God, all must be true. There must not only be no substantial disagreement, but no circumstantial variations. God could no more err in reference to little things, than great things. His words must all be true. (Applause and hisses. Time up.)

Dr. BERG.—(Applause.)—My opponent says that I point to no passage in support of my assertion, that we find substantial agreement with circumstantial variety in the Scriptures. Now, there is scarcely a child who cannot understand that substantial agreement between the accounts of different writers consists in both giving the same fact. He says, one passage asserts, 'And again the angel of the Lord was killed against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah' (2 Samuel, 24: 1); while another says, 'And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.' (1 Chronicles, 21: 1.) He adds, Where is the substantial agreement? Is God Satan? Why, the substantial agreement is, that David was tempted. Again he quotes, 'And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field.' (Matthew 27: 7); and compares it with, 'Now, this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity.' (Acts 1: 18.) The substantial agreement here is, that the field was bought, and with the price of Judas's treachery! (Laughter.)

We pass over the blasphemous comparison he institutes, by asking, 'Are God and Satan one?' and boldly assert that we have already answered his miserable subterfuge. We have said that the Bible must be taken as a whole, and we have referred him to the passage which says, 'Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man; but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.' James 1: 13, 14.

If my opponent will persist in advancing such arguments, he will lose his reputation for fairness. To quote passages out of their connection may be worthy of an Infidel, but it is unworthy of a man. (Hisses, tumultuous applause, cries of 'Keep quiet'.)

My opponent gives his oft-repeated argument, that Romans 13: 1-8, teaches that we are to submit to all rulers, be they good or bad, and that damnation is meted out to those who resist them, under any pretence whatever. It is not so. The passage teaches simply:

1. That civil government is ordained by God.
2. That civil government is worthy the respect and obedience of God's people, when rulers 'are not a terror to good works, but to the evil;' when government is conducted in accordance with the laws of God's word. It is the evil who are trying to stir up sedition and break down all governments, who will not admit the existence of any right rule, because it interferes with the exercises in which they delight, and the licentiousness to which their passions would lead them. Does the Bible teach obedience to despots, when their commands oppose his law? Does he assert that God is the author of kingcraft? He will know that it is in anger that God gave the Jews a king, and that the first form of government which God gave the Jews was a pure republic. My opponent says that it is written, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.' So it is written; and it is also written, 'Ye shall know them by their fruits. Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit;' and while we are not to indulge in an uncharitable or censorious spirit, we are not forbidden by that passage to form an estimate of any character from its fruits.

I had scarcely, when my time expired, entered upon my opponent's caricature of the window of the ark. The passage reads, 'And in a cubit shalt thou finish it above.'

Does this justify my opponent in asserting that this window was but one cubit square? In a cubit shalt thou finish it above! That is, the width of the window,—and the word is here used to designate the means of admitting light,—was a cubit above; merely showing that the roof of the ark in which it was placed sloped upward to a ridge about a cubit wide. Sure enough! Let my opponent answer that! My opponent asks, How could this ark be ventilated? How could the fith of these animals be all carried up, and thrown out of the window? Has he forgotten that there was a door to the ark? The farmer would sometimes use the door, sometimes the window of his barn. Like my opponent, I have a place in the country with a stable upon it; and it is a matter of indifference to me whether the refuse be thrown out of the door or window.

But, says my opponent, the Bible says nothing about ventilators! Well, but it says nothing about nails or spikes; but are we to suppose that the ark was held together without them? Instructions were given which were perfectly intelligible to Noah, and he acted upon them. The Bible speaks as to men of candor and sense. It does not presume, we will infer, that the ark was destitute of convenience and all comfort, because every little detail is not given. In relation to the door, I read: 'And the door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof; with lower, second and third stories shalt thou make it.'

This would seem to imply that each story was supplied with a door. The details of the measurement are pronounced by those in the profession best able to understand them, those who have large maritime experience, to be in strict accordance with the best results discovered in ship building by modern science. Noah must have had an extraordinary mechanical genius. Here, again, is internal evidence that Noah was divinely directed. The difficulty of getting all the animals to the ark, stated by my opponent, is just so difficult at all. Was God, the Maker and Creator of these animals, unable to guide them to the ark at the proper time, by prompting their instinct?

Let not my opponent confound his nameless God with the Christian God (Jehovah), who is the Creator and Sovereign of the universe—is proved to be the God of Nature, of Providence, and of Grace. This example of the ark is not only important on its intrinsic merits, but from the associations connected with it.

Infidels say, Present us facts that an unbiased world pronounces to be facts. Here is one. Was it a real occurrence? There is scarcely a historical account extant of any nation or tribe, or historical tradition, even, which does not embrace the notion, that, long ages ago, their ancestor was saved from a great flood of water. How! All accounts agree, that it was by enclosure in a large floating edifice of his own construction. Whence this intimation? Did the elder whither it? Did the stars announce it? Whence did Noah get the promptings that carried him forward in his designs? From the first rain? Why should he be alarmed at this? He had often seen rain before. Blot out the whole Mosaic account, and we find the notion or tradition of which

we speak, incorporated in the religious rites or ceremonies of all nations. We meet it in Greece, in Egypt, in India, in Britain. We find in all these countries its memorials installed, thus proving, under Providence, the fact of the flood's occurrence. Whence this consent? Does my opponent suppose that all mankind are fools, superstitious dupes, but Infidels? Now, does not this fact prove an intimation from God? Who else could give it? Why did Noah provide for protection from water, rather than from fire or earthquake? Because he was forewarned of God.

The Apostle says, 'Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house.'

Let us pass from all allusions in the teachings of Nature. We find truth imbedded in the earth; we find the discoveries of geology confirming a deluge.

My opponent says there are, in parts of the earth, no trace—

Mr. BARKER.—I did not say so. Prof. Hitchcock [holding up 'Religion of Geology'] says, there is no trace in any part of the earth of such a deluge as that spoken of in the Bible.

Dr. BERG.—Then Prof. Hitchcock tells us a makes a tremendous mistake. In almost all parts of the earth we find indelible impressions, firmly convincing us that God did bring about the catastrophe of submerging the world with water.

My opponent alludes to my remarks on Friday evening, on the first chapter of Genesis, and totally perverts them.

Let me now advance on the positive side of the argument for internal